



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,243	09/12/2005	Yoshikuni Sasaki	03045PCT	2418
23165 7590 08/11/2008 ROBERT J JACOBSON PA 650 BRIMHALL STREET SOUTH ST PAUL, MN 551161511				
EXAMINER				
ZIMMER, MARC S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/549,243

Applicant(s)

SASAKI ET AL.

Examiner

MARC S. ZIMMER

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11, 13-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fukumoto et al., JP 9-12855 for the reasons outlined previously.

Claims 6-11, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kuramoto et al., JP 2003-82045 for the reasons outlined previously.

Response to Arguments

Applicant contends that whereas Fukumoto carries out an emulsion polymerization to obtain the particles disclosed therein, the particles used as an additive in claim 7 are prepared via a seed polymerization polymerization approach thus

resulting in the formation of a different product. While the technique employed may be characterized as an emulsion polymerization in paragraph [0016], for which a translation has been offered by Applicant, that same paragraph very clearly states that the methacrylate monomer is "impregnated" into the rubber particles of the polyorganosiloxane latex so how can it not be said that the polymerizable monomer has not been absorbed by the polysiloxane? Comparative Example 1 of Applicants' Declaration ostensibly does not compare the instant invention with the closest prior art because it is implicit in their remarks that the monomer is not absorbed by the polysiloxane particles whereas Fukumoto indicates that there is uptake of the monomer by the polysiloxane latex in their method. The Examiner is unclear what precisely distinguishes the approach used by Fukumoto from that of Comparative Example 1 that enables them to still achieve impregnation of the monomer despite the fact that it hasn't been pre-emulsified. Nevertheless, the reference clearly indicates that monomer is absorbed and, hence, it is the Examiner's position that the outcome would be the same.

As for the rejection over Kuramoto, the Examiner finds it intriguing that Applicant can now confidently assert that the role of the surfactant outlined in paragraph [0054] is not that of a surface-active for emulsifying the vinyl monomer (second paragraph under the heading D.2.) when page 10 of their February 1, 2008 correspondence suggests that the exact role cannot be ascertained. Again, the Examiner cannot conceive of how, since the surfactant is mentioned in the context of preparing the organic polymer, that it could be said to operate in any other capacity than to facilitate stable conditions for vinyl polymer growth in the presence of the polysiloxane. Further, the comparative

Art Unit: 1796

experiment outlined in Applicant's declaration clearly does not mimic the conditions used in Kuramoto since no surfactant whatsoever is employed and, thus, is not a comparison with the closest prior art. That the method of the comparative example gives a broad particle size distribution whereas the method of Kuramoto gives a sharp, or narrow, particle size distribution only reinforces the premise that the approach of Kuramoto is more like that of Experiment 1 than Comparative Experiment 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 12 remains allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARC S. ZIMMER whose telephone number is (571)272-1096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 5, 2008

/Marc S. Zimmer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

10/549,243

Examiner

MARC S. ZIMMER

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

SASAKI ET AL.

Art Unit

1796